

Foreword In his speech on the 40th anniversary of the end of the war on May 8, 1945, the then Federal President Richard von Weizsäcker referred to the cruel expulsion of some 17 million Germans from the East and Southeast, with its approximately 2.5 million fatalities, as "forced wanderhood" and to the day of the capitulation of the German Wehrmacht as "Liberation Day". Thus, the history-falsifying re-education had reached a new dimension. Under the impression of this disastrous development and in anticipation of further distortions of German history on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the beginning of the Second World War, Dr. Heinrich Ebner, Tübingen, Heinz Ochsmann, Schwäbisch Hall, and the author of these lines decided to do some educational work against this. In several meetings, they developed the idea of a series of booklets on contemporary history, for which they quickly found a suitable publisher in the Tübingen Institute for German Postwar History and an open-minded, understanding and supportive publisher in Mr. Wigbert Grabert. The editor's preface to the first issue, dated September 1, 1989, states the purpose of the series: "This series is to be devoted to questions of contemporary history which, despite extensive scholarly clarification, are still presented to the general public and especially in some mass media according to the refuted scheme of re-education from the early postwar years. .. May the series also contribute to the spiritual recovery of our people." In many joint meetings, the aforementioned worked out the contents of the individual booklets. Dr. Ebner (born 1920 in Nördlingen) and Mr. Ochsmann (born 1920 in Bunzlau) benefited from their own experiences as members of the Wehrmacht during the Eastern campaign and during several years of Soviet captivity in the Ukraine and in Workuta. The fruitful cooperation based on many years of occupation with contemporary history as well as on own archives lasted until, after long serious illness, death took the pen from Dr. Ebner in 1997 and from Heinz Ochsmann in 2001. In the second half of the nineties, the historian Studiendirektor Götz Eberbach, Notzingen, was recruited as a collaborator. The Institute for German Postwar History was responsible for editing. Thus, from 1990 to 2003, a total of 15 issues of "Richtigstellungen" could be published, each with about twenty individual presentations on 64 pages. These booklets have been published in several editions and are still available individually. After the Allied victory celebrations on the 60th anniversary of the invasion of France in June 2004 and the commemorative speeches on the corresponding anniversary of the end of the war in May 2005 brought further examples of one-sided historical presentation, the publisher took up the suggestion, which had already been expressed by readers on various occasions, to publish an updated, substantially expanded and chronologically ordered edition of the contents of all the booklets published to date in two volumes. The first volume essentially covers the events up to the middle of the Second World War, the second those of the last years of the war and the post-war period with additions from the period before. The historian Dr. Olaf ROSE could be won for this revision. It was also possible to engage a number of other contributors for individual articles. The resulting repetitions and presentations of the same historical events from different points of view were deliberately retained. The new contributions, which have not yet been published in the individual issues, are usually signed off by name. Further additions are planned for a later time. The editors would be grateful for any suggestions and comments. Tübingen, September 1, 2005 Institute for German Postwar History Dr. Rolf Kosiek

Introduction 1. Falsifications of History and their Consequences Like a gray stream, lies and falsifications have accompanied history since ancient times. Why is this so? The answer is simple: forgeries mostly serve to justify those who are in possession of power and want to consolidate it. The Donatio Constantini (Donation of Constantine)¹ may be mentioned here as a representative example. It originated around the middle of the 8th century. The popes in the Middle Ages referred to it when justifying their claims to secular power. Contested as early as 1001 by Emperor Otto III, it was exposed as a forgery around 1440 by Laurentius Valla and also by Nicholas of Cusa. Important forgeries are also, after they have had their initial effect, sometimes concealed. Here an example from modern times: The

respected mountaineer, film actor and writer Luis Trenker published in 1948 in a scurrilous way an alleged >Diary< of Eva Braun, the wife of Adolf Hitler, which was fantasized together from front to back. It had been believed that with Trenker, an attractive name alone would be sufficient to dispel any doubts about the accuracy of the statement from the outset. The Munich Regional Court sentenced the publisher to a fine of DM 10,000² for the forgery. Such legends are not only a mistake, but pure fraud, which is usually unmasked sooner or later. As a modern example of this, the falsification of the former president of the Senate of Danzig, Hermann Rauschning, in his conversations with Hitler can be mentioned.³ It is no different with the forgery scandal surrounding the Reichstag fire.⁴ And as a peak and prime example of recent forgery – albeit for private-commercial reasons – Konrad Kujau can be cited, who >discovered< Hitler's diaries in 1983.⁵ In the 20th century, lies and forgeries have played an enormous role. At the outbreak of World War I, several states issued so-called color books. The Russians called theirs >Orangebuch<. According to Count Montgelas⁶, only 13 of 60 documents were correctly reproduced in it. The First World War brought the dictate of Versailles with the hair-raising lie of the German >blame< for this war (article 231). Today, many people in Germany accept such claims without thinking. Even worse: The re-education has made it possible in years of propaganda that one can say "right or wrong" with impunity. In other words: every crime of the victors is ignored and excused, only Germany has to atone forever and believe all the re-education lies. For a long time, German history has been criminalized by numerous authors. "More than twenty years ago, the Erlangen historian Hellmut Diwald⁷ wrote: "Those who criminalize the history of a people make it sick."⁸ The German people in particular have been burdened with the method of falsifying history for decades. Above all, Allied crimes are downplayed and trivialized. Even schoolchildren are exposed to some falsifications, even in >schoolbook recommendations<, which are prepared by special commissions. An example of a particularly gross abuse is the >German-Polish Textbook Recommendations<,⁹ which were adopted in 1976. Among other things, it states: "The territorial changes at the end of World War II were associated with extensive population shifts. they aimed at bringing state and ethnic boundaries into harmony as far as possible." But that is precisely what did not happen: Germans in East Germany were expelled from purely German lands. The murder (Ernst Jünger speaks of "Ausmordung")¹⁰ of hundreds of thousands of expellees In the great world wars of the past century, atrocity propaganda was carried out on a large scale as a means of war to mobilize world public opinion against the respective opponent and to morally condemn him. Already in the First World War, the Western Allies were far superior to the Germans in this respect and were plagued by much fewer scruples regarding the most incredible lies. In the decade after 1918, many widespread atrocity tales were corrected – partly by sincere Allied personalities themselves – so that they lost part of their effect of inciting peoples against each other. This was fundamentally different after the Second World War and as a result of the complete occupation of Germany. Only now did the Allied atrocity propaganda really begin to reach ever greater heights in the mass media dominated by the victors. It was put in the service of the re-education of the Germans, who were subjected to an extensive character laundering. With the help of an ever-increasing number of accomplices, the historical image of the victors was brought home to the Germans with sophisticated psychological methods, until most of them believed it and accepted it as true. An impressive example has been described by Professor Dr. Friedrich GRIMM, one of the most outstanding defense lawyers after 1918 and 1945 from the first post-war period, which shall be cited in its entirety because of its exemplary significance.¹¹ "In addition, in our time there is the devastating influence of the propaganda, which makes it so difficult for people, even the well-meaning, to recognize and judge the real events of the time. It already made things difficult for us in the last years of the First World War and afterwards. ... After the second German collapse it was no different. Now it was worse, because it was now a one-sided propaganda of the opponents, which could

no longer be countered on the part of the Germans. In May 1945, a few days after the collapse, I had a memorable discussion with an important representative of the opposing side. He introduced himself to me as a university professor from his country who wanted to talk to me about the historical foundations of the war. It was a high-level conversation that we had. Suddenly he broke off, pointing to the leaflets lying on the table in front of me, with which we were inundated in the first days after the surrender and which dealt mainly with the concentration camp atrocities. >What do you say to this?<, he asked me. I replied: >Oradour and Buchenwald?

You are preaching to the choir. I am a lawyer and I condemn injustice wherever I meet it, but most of all when it happens on our side. However, I know how to make a distinction between the facts and the political use that is made of them. I know what atrocity propaganda is. I have read all the publications of your experts on this question after the First World War, the writings of the Northcliffe Office, the book of the French Minister of Finance Klotz Vom Krieg zum Frieden, in which he describes how the fairy tale of the chopped off children's hands was invented and what use was made of it, the educational writings of the magazine Crapouillot, which compares the atrocity propaganda of 1870 with that of 1914/1918, and finally the classic book of Ponsonby: The Lie in War. In it it is revealed that already in the previous war one had magazines in which one put together artificial piles of corpses by photomontage with pupils. These pictures were distributed. The caption was left blank. With that, I pulled out one of the leaflets, which supposedly depicted corpse mountains from the concentration camps, and showed it to my visitor, who looked at me puzzled. I continued: >I cannot imagine that in this war, in which all weapons were so perfected, this spiritual poisonous weapon, which decided the first war, should have been neglected. More than that, I know it!

I read the foreign press daily during the last months before the collapse. There were reports about the German atrocities from a central office. That went after a certain rotation. One occupied territory after the other came up, today France, tomorrow Norway, then Belgium, Denmark, Holland, Greece, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. Towards the end of the Second World War, the Americans decided to re-educate the Germans. This re-education was supposed to change the nature of the Germans. It was to set the generations against each other, to falsify history to the detriment of Germany and to degrade the German people for generations to the sole culprit of history. The Marxist Frankfurt School< around Horkheimer and Adorno up to Habermas, which had come back to Germany with the victors, had prepared the re-education in the USA during the war and now provided the most zealous advocates of the victors' view of history, played a very significant role in this. Berthold Brecht once correctly stated: "The victor always writes the history of the defeated. The beater disfigures the features of the slain. Out of the world goes the weaker, and behind remains the lie." (Interrogation of Lucullus) Already Friedrich Schiller clearly recognized this fact. In his History of the Thirty Years' War he stated: "It is a misfortune for the dead man (meaning Wallenstein) that this enemy survived him and wrote his history."¹² The respected German journalist Winfried Martini (1905-1991) published a book worth reading in the year of his death with the descriptive title The Victor Writes History.¹³ In it he judged: "It is one of the most fascinating phenomena of our time to what extent a military defeat influences the writing of history and the general historical consciousness and the victor is spared moral judgments." About this method, the well-known American publicist and editor-in-chief of the New York World Walter Lippmann (1889-1974) found that a war could be considered lost only if one's own territory was occupied by the enemy, the leading stratum of the defeated people was tried in war crimes trials, and the defeated were subjected to a re-education program. An obvious means of doing this, he says, is to implant the presentation of history from the victor's point of view into the brains of the vanquished. Of decisive importance is the transfer of the moral categories of the war propaganda of the victorious state into the consciousness of the vanquished. Only when the war propaganda of the victors has found its

way into the history books of the vanquished and is believed by the following generation, only then can the re-education be regarded as truly successful.¹⁴ The Romanian writer Eugene Ionesco wrote the following sentences in the Parisian Figaro Litteraire in 1969: "The victor, said a philosopher recently, imposes his >truth<, his >laws< and his >philosophy of life< on the vanquished. Only when the defeated accepts the philosophy of the victor is he really defeated." And Napoleon I is reported to have said that history is the lie agreed upon. Under the unusual post-war conditions with the occupation rule, it was then possible for the Swiss historian Walter Hofer to declare that he rejected an "objective historical research" (meaning one about the Third Reich). Hereby a condition is brought about, as George Orwell described it in his novel 1984. The Ministry of Truth (called "Miniwahr" in the novel) determines there what is to be valid. "Ignorance is strength" is a motto. Today, the prevailing political correctness determines what is to be erased from memory as far as possible: all the crimes of the Allies from East and West, the expulsion and murder of the Sudeten Germans, the Silesians and the Bessarabian Germans, for example. There should be no talk of the millionfold violations of German women and girls by the victors, but a German should always be only a penitent, a subject and a willing payer. The citizen's opinion on particular questions of contemporary history is even criminalized in order to better muzzle him. There is a big difference between the current reality and what is written about freedom of opinion in Article 5 of the Basic Law. There is no more freedom of opinion in the area of contemporary history in the Federal Republic of Germany than there is freedom of the press. Just look up § 130 in the penal code (e.g. Lackner, 18th edition) to see with what cunning the freedom of opinion has been put in a trap. As far as freedom of the press is concerned, reference should be made to a letter by the late journalist Paul Sethe¹⁵. In it, he writes that the Basic Law contains wonderful provisions on the freedom of the press. As is so often the case, however, the reality of the constitution is quite different from the written constitution. Freedom of the press, he said, is the freedom of two hundred rich people to disseminate their opinions. This is so, and all other assertions are not true. After the Second World War, to burden the Germans, a momentous expression was spread: the collective guilt. When this so-called technical expression proved to be politically useless, the "common historical responsibility" came on the scene. No one knows what "common historical responsibility" actually is. And no one knows why they of all people should have it. How far back does the common historical responsibility go? Many a young person in Germany asks. Can one be held responsible for events that took place when the person in question was not even alive? Are young Frenchmen responsible for the looting of Freudenstadt (in 1945)? Or young Englishmen of today for the mass murder in Dresden in February 1945? Or are the Jews responsible for the crimes committed by Trotsky against the sailors of Kronstadt in 1921 or by Lazar M. Kaganovich? We Germans are blamed for murders that we could not have committed.¹⁶ The Russians admitted the truth later on their own initiative - as in 1990 at Katyn. But never has a leading politician in Bonn or Berlin stood up for the honor of the German soldier and rejected the infamous accusations. One must defend oneself against this re-education. All the propaganda theses of the re-educators must be countered by the truth. However, this also presupposes knowledge of historical facts that exonerate Germany, facts that are largely concealed in the Federal Republic of Germany today.

4. The Anti-Wehrmacht Exhibition as an Example of Historical Falsification

As the generation of experience in Germany began to fade away more and more at the turn of the last century, the one-sided coming to terms with the past on the part of influential circles also led to an increase in the attribution of blame to Germans, without - as is normal and prescribed for every accusation - even wanting to hear the defense. This can be seen especially in the unjustified accusation of the German Wehrmacht, which certain groups - against all historical truth - want to label as a >criminal gang<, thus taking up and continuing STALIN's disinformation policy. The exhibition "Vernichtungskrieg. Crimes of the Wehrmacht 1941 to 1944" under the direction of Hannes Heer, who

had previously been active as a communist and had several relevant criminal convictions. Since 1995, this work of art, financed by the private Hamburg >Institute for Social Research< of the billionaire Jan Philipp REEMTSMA, has been touring numerous German cities. Class by class, many pupils were led into it by their teachers, were given a false picture of history and were incited against the generation of their fathers and grandfathers. Numerous political representatives paying homage to re-education, starting with the then chairman of the Central Council of Jews in Germany, Ignatz BUBIS, and the president of the Federal Constitutional Court, Jutta LIMBACH, had recommended the exhibition, to which public buildings and even state parliaments were made available. Evidence of falsifications and one-sidedness deceiving the viewers was not taken into account, because it allegedly came from right-wing or nationally-minded personalities, and could therefore be shot down with the >fascism club<. The organizers were not afraid to take legal action against justified criticism and, trusting in the ruling political justice system in today's Germany, to criminalize justified accusations. The fact that, on the other hand, the responsible public prosecutor's offices always dropped the justified accusations against this exhibition that it was

perpetrating sedition, also characterizes the current state of the Federal German legal system. It took two young foreign historians, Bogdan Musial from Poland and Krisztian Ungvary from Hungary, as late as October 1999 – which is just as characteristic of the situation in present-day Germany – to lend sufficient weight to the accusations against this exhibition.¹⁷ At first, Heer even attempted to take legal action against these scholars by means of injunctions, but this failed miserably.¹⁸ A few weeks later, the HEER-REEMTSMA anti-Wehrmacht exhibition had to be withdrawn in the face of the manifold proofs of obvious falsifications and one-sided distortions presented by foreign and domestic¹⁹ historians, and its director Hannes HEER had to be dismissed for deliberate falsification of history. Already planned exhibition dates in Braunschweig in November 1999, Wiesbaden in January 2000 and Gießen in February/March 2000 had to be abandoned, as well as the premiere of an English version planned for New York at the Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art from December 3, 1999 to February 5, 2000. Nevertheless, the initiators did not abandon their goal of general and general defamation of the German Wehrmacht and its members, >revised< the exhibition with the participation of scientists committed to the spirit of the times and reopened it in Berlin on November 27, 2001. Afterwards, it toured German cities again and, continuing the previous re-education by distorting the historical truth, continued to unjustly accuse the generation of our fathers and grandfathers. However, it lost a lot of its persuasive power. What this was really about, its former director HEER let it be known in the summer of 1999, when he declared, "The exhibition has succeeded in tipping the war of annihilation into families, where the soldiering role of fathers and grandfathers is now questioned and seen in a completely different light."²⁰ Thus, in continuation of the nation-destroying generational and gender struggle pro- posed by the neo-Marxist Frankfurt School, the exhibition supposedly dedicated to historical understanding was to serve as a po- litical means of struggle for the dissolution of German self-confidence and self-assertion. And it is therefore no coincidence if all anti-people forces rallied around it again and promoted it. For almost five years, starting in 1995, it had passed through the German lands without German historians – with a few praiseworthy exceptions, such as the professor emeritus of history at the Munich Bundeswehrhochschule, Dr. Franz W. Seidler²¹ – making any effective effort to put an end to the scandal or even dealing more closely with the communist machination. The reason why this could happen in a country with the great tradition of German history writing was aptly summarized by FOCUS editor-in-chief Helmut MARKWORT²²: "Why has no German historian uncovered the many errors and deceptions?

The answer is given by history professors only if we promise not to mention our names: >Every

historian saw immediately how sloppy and suggestive the exhibition was set up, but who wants to be publicly beaten up?"< The mass media, essentially trimmed to political correctness, hardly allowed any criticism of the re-education indoctrination. This is an indictment of science and at the same time a bankruptcy of the free constitutional state, which wants to represent the right of freedom of opinion, not less also of the media itself. 5 Forgetting as a Means of Falsification The historical truth forces us to follow an advice of the Allgemeine jüdische Wochengeitung²³ : to defend ourselves against the "collective forgetting" ²⁴ which is becoming more and more widespread and is being promoted. G. Orwell expressed himself clearly on this in his famous book 1984.²⁵ He described for his utopian society as a means of enforcing the dictatorship of opinion that certain facts had to be poured into a "thought hole" so that they would then disappear forever and history could be completely rewritten. An example of this is offered by the Congo atrocities, which once excited the whole of Europe and which Belgians were guilty of in the eighties of the 19th century. They are only rarely mentioned in passing, for example in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung on February 10, 2005 by Andreas ECKERT in the article "Die abgehackten Hände". Like many other things, they are thrown into the thought hole, to speak with Orwell. It is similar with the genocide of the Indians in the USA and with the Vietnamese village My Lai, which was razed to the ground by the Americans more than a quarter of a century ago and whose inhabitants were cruelly destroyed. Noble democrats do not speak about it today: an example of collective forgetting. The omission of facts and the associated deliberate concealment of reality are among the most important sins of contemporary historiography. Everything that does not fit into the prevailing thought system is put into the famous ORWELL "thought hole". The Soviet propagandist of hate Ilya Ehrenburg has the standard excuse: "Forgetfulness was sometimes an imperative of self-preservation! In his novel The Fall of Paris he simply forgot about the German-Soviet pact. In the novel Sturm he eulogized outrageously the mass murderer Tito, in later editions these sentences were removed. The lie of Katyn is another example (diligently lied about by the >BRD-publicists< - at least until 1990!). Since 1943 the insiders in East and West knew the true facts, that the Soviets had liquidated tens of thousands of captured Polish officers in 1940. Knowing the true facts even then, CHURCHILL said only: "The Bolsheviks can be very cruel." He added that ruthlessness was a source of strength, and this was of use as far as the killing of Germans was concerned. This is reported to us by the Polish diplomat Edward Rasward Ras- ZINSKI. As is known, CHURCHILL, who is also personally responsible for the destruction of Dresden, has nevertheless been awarded the Charlemagne Prize of Aachen, and in Bonn there is a CHURCHILL Street: a real disgrace. Remembering the demand that atrocities must never be forgotten,²⁶ we too should never forget the monstrous crimes of the Allies in East and West. It is not a matter of offsetting. That is the convenient killing formula of the re-educators and their German helpers. If it is not about >offsetting<, what is it about? The answer is: It is about the truth, about this in itself and about it as the basis of the future. Former Chancellor Kohl stated:²⁷ "We must never forget, repress or trivialize the Nazi atrocities, because only through remembrance are we enabled to reconcile." So it is. If we too constantly remember the crimes committed against our compatriots, we will be empowered to reconcile. Elsewhere it is said in this regard:²⁸ "It is not permissible to forget." Let us adhere to this. And the Czech President Vaclav HAVEL judged in a speech with the following much quoted words: "The assumption to be able to maneuver through history with impunity and to rewrite one's own biography belongs to the traditional Central European delusions. . . for there is no full freedom where truth is not given free rein." ²⁹ And one can add: Where history is manipulated with the penal code³⁰ there is also no truth and thus no freedom. The former Federal President Gustav Heinemann declared during his term in office: "It is of no use to give history censorship retrospectively. We no longer change it." ³¹ We agree with this and see it as our task to come as close as possible to the historical truth, to show - to take up the famous

word of the historian Ranke – how things were. At present, and especially in Germany, the writing of contemporary history has often degenerated into a fine whore of politics. Omission and forgetting are the main concerns of the re-educators among historians. 6 On the importance of openness for historical truth One should "face history in all openness. In all openness and without prejudice. With the courage of the full truth. Adding nothing, but also leaving nothing out, concealing nothing." These words from the speech of the then Federal President Roman Herzog in Warsaw on August 1, 1994, can be unreservedly agreed with, indeed they should actually be a self-evident motto of responsible historians, especially in the field of contemporary history. But in contrast to the quoted demand, one-sidedness and prejudice, even prohibitions of thought and threats of punishment for expressing justifiable views, still prevail to a large extent in the official consideration of the time of the World Wars in the Federal Republic. In his speech, the President of the Federal Republic also violated the maxim he had set himself. He not only presented German guilt in a one-sided way, magnified it and made unjustified accusations, but also concealed all the injustices inflicted on the Germans by Poles before and after the Second World War, which, however, must not be forgotten in this context: the theft of extensive East German land as early as 1919 – long before Hitler; the illegal separation of East Upper Silesia from the Reich in 1921, contrary to the clear result of the referendum of March 20, 1921; the suppression of the German Reich by Poland in 1921. March 1921; the oppression of the ethnic Germans in Poland before the beginning of the war; the murder of thousands of ethnic Germans in September 1939; the expulsion in 1945/49 in violation of international law after the annexation of East Germany in 1945, which was also in violation of international law and resulted in millions of deaths; the continued withholding of the right of self-determination and cultural autonomy for the more than one million East Germans in the above-mentioned areas from East Prussia to West Prussia, Gdansk and East Brandenburg to Silesia.

Roman Herzog has proven to be a typical >Sühnedeutscher< who is doing >Trauerarbeit<. No less a person than the emperor's son Otto von Habsburg wrote: "There is nothing more unbearable than this type of atonement German, who does nothing but slide around on his knees and beg the world for forgiveness that he exists." 32 The Polish uprising in Warsaw in the summer of 1944 in the hinterland of the German front, mentioned by Roman Herzog, could not be tolerated by the Wehrmacht, but had to be put down in order to consolidate the front – every military tactician has to admit that. The Germans, however, did not treat the Polish insurgents as partisans and shoot them, which would have been permitted under the international law of war, but regarded them as regular soldiers and treated their commander, General Bor-Komorowski, with all military honors when they were captured – in contrast to the often unworthy and dishonorable treatment of German army commanders by the Allies in East and West from May 1945 on. Captured Polish officers had universities in the German camps, where they survived the war well, until the end of the war. All this was concealed by the Federal President in Warsaw, as well as by the entire "free" press in Germany, in the reports on the Warsaw commemorations of August 1, 1994. In the same year, the Federal Constitutional Court stated in its ruling of January 11, 1994: "Free discussion is the very foundation of a free and democratic society. Young people, too, can only become responsible citizens if their critical faculties are strengthened in the debate about different opinions. This is especially true when dealing with recent German history. The communication of historical events and the critical examination of dissenting opinions can protect young people very much and more effectively from susceptibility to distorting representations of history than indexing, which could even lend such opinions an unjustified attraction." (Ref.: 1 BvR 434/87) 7. Science Requires Permanent Revision A revision of the one-sidedly distorted historical image of re-education outlined above has been demanded in the Federal Republic of Germany for decades. In the Historikerstreit of 1986 (Rolf Kosiek, Historikerstreit und Geschichtsrevision, Grabert-Verlag, Tübingen 1987) the necessity of such a correction was pointed out by recognized historians such as Ernst

Nolte, Andreas Hillgruber and others. Its realization, however, was prevented by representatives of the prevailing political correctness, especially by members of the >Frankfurt School< with Jürgen Habermas at its head, at that time and until today. For some years revisionism has even been regarded as a sign of right-wing extremism and mentioned as an accusation in the reports on the protection of the constitution.³³ Yet revision is a normal and almost necessary process in all sciences. The sciences are practically constantly >in revision, since old theories have to prove themselves against new findings and experiments or have to be resigned. Known are revisions or checks also at the judiciary (a case goes >in revision<) or at the tax office (tax check) as in the general administration (control). There, where everything is in order and the cash is correct, one looks calmly against such examinations. An audit is only feared if one has to fear the discovery of errors or even fraud. Therefore, auditors are avoided or even hated by those who are guilty of misconduct or who are afraid of being found out. Should this also be the real reason why one side in the historians' dispute since 1986 turned so passionately against any revisionism and even demanded – like Habermas – the introduction and observance of taboos and prohibitions of thought under the claim of enlightenment?

Why are historians like Ernst Nolte demonized and discriminated against because they dared to swim against the current of published opinion with good reasons and to point out historical facts? For only with the courage to revise can one reach the sources, the knowledge of which is important for the future of a national community. For this ancient truth, let us list two recognized witnesses: Henrik Ibsen wrote: "The spirit of truth and the spirit of freedom – these are the pillars of society." And Novalis expressed, "Man consists in truth. If he gives away the truth, he gives away himself. He who betrays the truth betrays himself." For the time of the Third Reich, it was and is generally known that there was no complete freedom of expression. The implementation of a political revolution, which, in contrast to the upheavals in other states, was bloodless, and the Second World War, which soon began, with the mobilization of all reserves, do not excuse this deficiency, but must be taken into account for a just judgment. But how does it look today in a time of peace and without internal or external threats? To publish this thought alone already causes uncertainty, whether such thinking is not already easily – as in Orwell – disapproved of by the ruling police of opinion and the thinker of such insubordination is blacklisted, in order to be harassed, for example, with a house search or silenced by arrest the next time a free thought is expressed, which is not in line with Big Brother – the political correctness ruling today. Special criminal laws and the increasing pressure of >political correctness< restrict free speech. Even the expression of a seemingly justified and reasonable doubt, the prerequisite of any free opinion, has been punishable in certain cases for some time, because according to common judicial practice, the person concerned can then be accused of incitement of the people. For the simple, untrained citizen and worker, who is not familiar with the constantly changing gray areas of the penal laws in this area, it is therefore advisable either to agree to everything that is offered by politicians and the media, as is expected of a subject (even if this was once frowned upon), or to remain silent, because, contrary to the theory of the Basic Law, there is no longer any freedom of opinion in the Federal Republic of Germany. Book burnings in the Nazi era are judged as injustice, even if they were mostly only symbolic on a few copies and did not result in such mass book destructions as after 1945. But why, the mature citizen who has been brought up to be critical must ask himself, is there today, in view of Article 5 of our Basic Law with its guarantee of freedom of opinion and the prohibition of censorship, an index for books that may not be distributed? Why is it that today, in the so often invoked "most free state in German history," books on contemporary topics are confiscated, and publishers and authors are charged and punished? The difference between the public book burning of the thirties and the present burning of such confiscated whole pallets of books in heating plants is then only slight. And yet the truth is gradually asserting itself: "... and it does move!" Thus in the year 1995 for the revisionism with the

excellent and very recommendable book *Stalins Vernichtungskrieg 1941 bis 1945*³⁴ of the scientific director at the Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsamt in Freiburg, Dr. Joachim HOFFMANN, a large breakthrough succeeded. In this carefully documented book, not only has STALIN's intention to attack Central Europe in the summer of 1941 been confirmed, but many war crimes attributed to the Germans have been proven to have been carried out by the Soviets. Likewise, Ilya EHRENBURG's propaganda of hatred against everything German is presented in detail. In the preface it says about the present situation of the freedom of opinion: "Because a decades-long and more and more one-sided influencing of opinion has caused an ignorance among the broad public in Germany in the meantime and has let arise conceptions which find expression also in the press in almost disarming assertions and statements about the tragic events of those years (1945/46). The fact that the last troops of the former occupation army of the Soviet Union, who left in 1994, are still filled with the propaganda thesis, which was only inserted later, that the Red Army had fulfilled a >liberation mission< in Germany in 1944/1945, and that the Red Army soldiers finally appeared and were received in Germany as >liberators<, will not be held against the present Russian soldiers. They cannot know otherwise, when even President EL'CYN still announced on September 1, 1994, on the occasion of the withdrawal of the former occupation troops in Berlin, that the >Russians< (he meant the Soviets) in soldier's coats had not come to Germany to raze it to the ground, to destroy the German people or to make them the servant of the >Russians< (the Soviets). Even in the years of the most difficult trial, a clear line had been drawn between the >simple< Germans and the criminal clique< which had come to power in Germany.... If, on the other hand, in the German public, which has all information possibilities at its disposal, a sentiment is spreading according to which the Germans have been >liberated< by the armies of the Stalinist Soviet Union, there is no excuse for this, since the historical reality is almost turned upside down. For the Red Army did not invade as a >liberator<, even if the victory monuments erected in some places are supposed to suggest this today: and probably nobody in Germany felt it as a liberator at that time. According to their own slogans, STALIN's soldiers did not come as liberators, but as merciless avengers.

¹ There is nothing to add to this description. 8. Criminalization of Revisionism The year 1995 in particular, with its series of commemorative speeches and anniversary celebrations for the 50th anniversary of the end of the war, brought not only many one-sided representations of history, but also an unprecedented

number of bans and confiscations of revisionist books. For example, the following books were confiscated by court order: Ernst Gauss (ed.), *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte* (1994), Steffen Werner, *Die zweite babylonische Gefangenschaft* (1990), Erwin Soratroy, *Attilas Erben auf Davids Thron* (1992), Ingrid Weckert, *Feuerzeichen* (1990), Carl-Friedrich Berg, *In Sachen Deutschland* (1994). House searches with partial confiscation of files, computers and other publishing documents were carried out at, among others: Grabert-Verlag, Tübingen; Hohenrain-Verlag, Tübingen; Verlag für Volkstum und Zeitgeschichte-forschung, Vlotho; Verlag Nation Europa, Coburg; Faksimile-Verlag, Bremen; Verlag der Freunde, Berlin; Aula-Verlag, Graz; Verlag Neue Visionen, Würenlos (Switzerland); Verlag Werner Symanek, Waldalgesheim; Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft, Preußisch Oldendorf. Criminal proceedings were instituted against a number of publishers, editors, authors, contributors to collective works, editors for alleged incitement of the people,² insult or disparagement of deceased persons by statements on events more than 50 years in the past. Some trials ended in the first instance with disproportionately high prison sentences or fines. In such proceedings, as a rule, the obviousness of certain historical events is assumed, without the results of recent historical research even being admitted to court, let alone seriously discussed or judged. For the evaluation of these conditions PLATON is to be quoted here: "Nobody creates greater injustice than he who commits it in forms of law." And Frederick the Great once reproached leading jurists: "A judiciary college that practices injustice is more

dangerous and worse than a gang of thieves: from them one can protect oneself; but from pranksters who use the cloak of justice to carry out their evil passions, from them no man can beware; they are worse than the greatest rogues that are in the world, and merit a double punishment. "3 What should be self-evident for a constitutional state, the already above mentioned jurist Friedrich Grimm already summarized in 1953 in view of obvious abuse of justice after quoting the old legal sentence in the words: "Justitia est fundamentum regnorum! – Justice is the foundation of the state! This commitment to justice has still proven to be correct. This is a simple truth that must be recalled to our generation, which is beginning to doubt everything that has hitherto seemed sacred and dear to us. We must return to the rule of law. This includes, first and foremost, the clean separation of law and politics. The principle of separation of powers, which has been customary for us since Montesquieu, must regain general validity, not only for the classical division into legislation, jurisdiction and administration, but also for the separation of politics and law. The judiciary must once again serve the law and only the law. "4 This demand is more topical today than ever before, after party cartels have subtly instrumentalized the law to secure their rule and the fundamental right to freedom of expression has been increasingly restricted. It is actually shameful that in Germany, the former stronghold of world-wide leading and recognized historiography, today so little attention is paid to the revision of contemporary history, which has been dominated by Allied war propaganda up to now, even that the revisionists are fought and criminalized by influential and state authorities. In the last decade, the German judiciary has unfortunately allowed itself to be degraded and abused in many cases, in violation of the constitutional guarantee of freedom of opinion and science and in disregard of fundamental legal principles, to become the servant of a one-sided view of history by condemning authors and publishers for critical but thoroughly justified books. Ernst-Günter Kögel, Manfred Röder or Ernst Zündel, who are serving time in German prisons in the summer of 2005 solely for crimes of opinion, offer eloquent examples of this. As a German, one can only look enviously abroad, where in Italy an outspoken revisionist like De Felice was elected >man of the year< by the newspaper liberal, where in France the proceedings against Professor Dr. Robert Faurisson for statements on the Holocaust were dropped, where in England and Belgium books banned in Germany may appear and be distributed, not to mention the freedom of speech in the USA. President Herzog did declare in his inaugural speech:

"What is important... is the unvarnished, open view of historical truth and the willingness neither to make up nor to hide this historical truth," and in Dresden on February 13, 1995: "You cannot overcome history, you cannot find peace or reconciliation, if you do not face the whole of history," but the Federal German reality, with its still one-sided view of history, completely committed to re-education, unfortunately looks different. Hundreds of German citizens have had to experience this firsthand in the past decades and up to the present, when they had to endure house searches and prosecution proceedings against them because they had obtained books for information and in the struggle for historical truth, the content of which was not to the liking of certain circles and which were later banned after special laws were passed only a few years ago. The books, which were confiscated by the thousands from publishers, bookstores and individual purchasers, were burned – allegedly in heating plants – a process that was – rightly – blamed on an earlier system. 9 Successes of Revisionism In the long run, historical truth prevails in contemporary history, too, despite fierce resistance from certain circles. Moscow's official admission in the spring of 1990 that it was the Soviets who murdered the tens of thousands of captured Polish officers in Katyn Forest and elsewhere in 1940 was an example, and also rehabilitated the German soldiers sentenced to death and executed in Russia after the end of the war as allegedly guilty of this crime. The year 2002 brought – some 60 years after the events of that time – two further noteworthy events in the direction of a necessary revisionism in contemporary history as well as for its treatment in public. On the one hand, Fritjof Meyer, the leading editor of *Der Spiegel*, who is regarded

as an expert on Eastern Europe, published an article on the number of victims of the Auschwitz concentration camp in the May issue of the specialist journal *Osteuropa*⁵. In it, based on the evaluation of new sources, the author corrected the prevailing opinion about the nature and extent of the mass extermination reported there, especially in two areas. He further reduced the total number of victims of the camp, which had already been reduced by several million (from 4 to 1.5 million) by foreign Auschwitz experts in the 1990s, to a total of about 5,150,000. In addition, he raised serious doubts about the use of certain buildings there as gas chambers, which had been assumed so far by the prevailing doctrine, and indicated farmhouses with a much smaller capacity for this purpose. Besides the content of this magazine article, which, if it had been the responsibility of a >right-wing< author, would probably have brought him immediate prosecution for trivializing the Holocaust in its nature and scope, the external circumstances of its publication are noteworthy. The article was >hidden< in a little-read trade journal, for which among others Mrs. Rita SÜSSMUTH, the former president of the Bundestag, is responsible, and not in the house magazine of the author, the *Spiegel*, which is quite suitable for such explosive topics. Except for criticism in a few media, the author has also been spared criminal prosecution – at least so far – despite the taboo-breaking and the obvious violation of political correctness, and the issue in question has not been confiscated or banned so far – again in contrast to the prevailing practice with right-wing revisionist writings. The second surprise resulted from the appearance and reception of the book *Der Brand* by Jörg Friedrich⁶ about the Anglo-American bombing war against the German civilian population. In a few autumn weeks, several editions of over 50,000 copies were sold, and the work continued to >boom<. All major newspapers carried extensive reviews, although the accusation of war crimes by the >massa- kers< against civilians and the unnecessary destruction of irreplaceable cultural assets by incendiary and demolition bombs against the Allies responsible for the bombing terror, especially Churchill, could not be ignored. The fact that these merciless extermination strikes against civilians also affected French and Italians, among others, is proven by the present book.⁷ Extensive accounts of this war crime had already been available for decades, and there was hardly any new data to report. However, for the first time, the author, through his gripping portrayal of the fear of those affected, mostly women and children, was able to make the reader experience the gruesome events directly. Furthermore, through his interspersed descriptions of the cultural history of the senselessly destroyed art treasures, he had addressed a special level in the reader that had not been touched by the purely factual descriptions of earlier reference books. The mourning of an entire generation, suppressed and repressed by re-education, was clearly addressed here for the first time, and again not by a right-wing revisionist, but by a respected historian with several works on contemporary history to his credit. The surprisingly good reception of the book by readers as well as critics seems to indicate a change in public opinion to finally want to deal with areas of contemporary history that have been taboo so far, but are necessary for a balanced assessment of history, such as

the terror of the bombing, the expulsion, and the post-war treatment of the Germans. More than two generations after the end of the war, the outcome of which continues to have a particularly strong influence on today's politics and in the run-up to new wars, a further, long overdue and necessary revision of the view of history, in which there is also a place for German fate and German suffering, is thus finally emerging. These events also prove that there is still no reasonably balanced and definitive picture of contemporary history. Corrections are still necessary and will be made, even if special criminal laws in Germany will try to prevent this for some time. ¹⁰ The Present Situation More than half a century after the end of the Second World War, the still continuing⁸ psychological warfare against the German people has reached a new quality. While until then the mass exterminations described by official historical research as having been carried out under the greatest secrecy by only a few persons

were in the center of attention, it seems that since about 1995 the whole German people are increasingly to be included in the perpetrators' sphere. Outstanding examples for this are the book *Hitlers willige Vollstrecker*⁹ (Hitler's Willing Executioners) by the young American Jew Daniel Goldhagen, which recognized historians rightly accused of gross one-sidedness and falsifications, and the above-mentioned anti-Wehrmacht exhibition of the private Hamburg Institute for Social Research, which was shown in many German cities starting in 1995 and which was proven to contain numerous obviously deliberate falsifications of history¹⁰. The book as well as the exhibition and its catalog have in common that they – in clear contradiction to the historical truth – want to assign a singular guilt for the Second World War and its horrors to large parts of the German people or even to the war generation as a whole, which is not justified. In view of this new situation, increased clarification is necessary. The professor of history at the Bundeswehrhochschule in Munich, who is above suspicion and has several fundamental works on contemporary history to his credit, Prof. Dr. Franz W. SEIDLER, in the preface to his highly recommended book *Verbrechen an der Wehrmacht* (Crimes against the Wehrmacht),¹¹ written in response to the unspeakable anti-Wehrmacht exhibition, commented on the current situation in Germany, stating: "Only those who help to stamp the armed forces of the former German Reich as a criminal gang will find the goodwill of the mood and opinion makers. Those who call soldiers murderers in general even act in accordance with the Federal Constitutional Court. On the other hand, anyone who portrays the Wehrmacht as victims is doing something inappropriate to the zeitgeist. What is politically correct in Germany is generally decided by the media. For example, anyone who says: >I am ashamed to be German< is acting politically correct. Whoever says: >I am proud to be German< is a >Nazi<. Who says: >The criminal HiTLER-Wehr- macht has insidiously and treacherously invaded the peace-loving Soviet Union in June 1941<, makes a politically correct statement, even if it is scientifically untenable. One speaks up and down of >Hitler soldiers<, but nobody takes words like >STALIN soldiers<, >Churchill bomber pilots< or >TRUMAN atomic bomb throwers< into his mouth. Whoever supports the erection of monuments for deserters from the German armed forces during World War II is acting politically correct, even if it is scientifically proven that no state can be made with the deserters for many reasons. Whoever points out that almost two million foreigners in German uniform fought with the Wehrmacht against Stalinism is terribly incorrect, even if the statement cannot be refuted. At present, it is politically correct to praise civilian service as superior to military service and in no way as substitute service, and to denigrate military virtues as secondary virtues with which one could also run a concentration camp. The media tell the citizen which topics meet the requirements of political correctness, with which popular pedagogical orientation he has to lead the discussion and which expressions he has to avoid. The choice of words steers the conversation. .. But science – if it wants to be real science – cannot care whether its findings are politically opportune or not. Committed solely to the truth, its task is to bring the unknown to light, to present facts, to expose legends and to revise false statements. Article 5, Paragraph 3 of the Basic Law safeguards the freedom of the scientist. in the circle of social scientists, historians have a particularly difficult time. They know that much of what is written in the textbooks is wrong. But that was probably also the case in the past. Schopenhauer already 150 years ago summarized his judgment about this science in the following words:

>History is infected with falsehood like a whore with syphilis.< In other words, history has outstripped statistics in terms of the unseriousness of surveys and the manipulation of results." The present situation also includes mention of the fact that more than six decades after the end of World War II, important Allied files from that period are still kept secret. This applies, for example, to the British files on Rudolf Hess's 1941 peace mediation flight to Scotland. The secrecy period for these documents was extended once again under the THATCHER government until 2017, and in some cases

until 2019. The same applies to the events of the show trial in Bordeaux from January 13 to March 12, 1953, against the SS members who were accused of war crimes against the civilian population in Oradour, France, in June 1944: More than 40 defendants were sentenced to severe penalties, some to death. It was immediately agreed with the German government that the sentences would not be carried out and that all those convicted would soon be released after promising never to say anything about the true events at Oradour. The Federal Government undertook never to question the – demonstrably false – allegations of the sentences and to keep the files relating to them secret. Afterwards, all those convicted were pardoned by the French side, and the trial files were placed in a secret archive for 70 years.¹² Even today, the false allegations are proclaimed as historical truth at annual celebrations in Oradour. Similarly long periods of secrecy apply to files on French victors' justice in Württemberg or to material on crimes committed by Danish resistance fighters. Furthermore, some of the German official files captured by the Americans in 1945 are still being kept under lock and key in the United States. On the one hand, sources that certainly exonerate Germany are still being withheld from research, so that a one-sided view of history must inevitably emerge. On the other hand, so-called "key documents" were >obtained< from the confiscated German documents, such as the Hossbach Protocol or the Wannsee Protocol. The available and published copies of these documents are in all probability, on the basis of convincingly presented evidence, subsequent forgeries, which were, however, presented and evaluated as "evidence" of German guilt at Allied war crimes trials, for example at the Nuremberg Military Tribunal in 1945/46. Some of the archives of Moscow have also been closed again, after a part of them was released after the turnaround in the East in 1990, and they certainly still hold some surprises. Here it is to be asked why, against all international custom, decisive and for the evaluation of the time and its background extremely important files are still kept secret by the four Allies, victorious in 1945, more than 60 years after the end of the war, and thus remain hidden even from research, which should be enabled to describe the history of the Second World War and its causes as they really were. But this is objectively possible only if all files are put on the table, including those of the winning side. The only convincing reason for this action of the four Allies is that they shy away from the historical truth and want to prevent a justified revision of the view of history they have proclaimed so far. And the incomprehensible thing is that German historians accept this and are content with the fact that the mass media do not point out this untenable state of affairs and demand justice in this area for Germany as well. Recently – without the general public taking much notice of it or being informed about it in detail – some exciting revelations happened. Thus it has been shown with overwhelming evidence that, as was suspected immediately after his death on the basis of the numerous contradictions of official statements and available circumstantial evidence, the ninety-three-year-old Rudolf Hess, who was the last condemned man to be held in Spandau, was murdered on August 17, 1987, by two agents on British orders, so that he would not be released by the Soviets soon afterward, as announced by GORBATSHEV, and be able to speak in freedom.¹³ It was also made extremely likely that in connection with the HESS case, his teacher and confidant, the Munich geopolitician Professor Dr. Karl HAUS- HOFER, who helped prepare the HESS flight, and his wife, both of whom were said to have committed suicide, were murdered by British intelligence agents near their home in 1946. This was to prevent HAUSHOFER's testimony at the Nuremberg trial on HESS's peace mission, which was planned at that time.¹⁴ Similarly, according to British files which surfaced in 2002/03, Reichsführer SS Heinrich Himmler did not commit suicide in English captivity in May 1945, as was officially stated until then, but was murdered there so that he could no longer reveal anything about the peace initiatives he led, among other things, which would have extremely incriminated London.¹⁵ However, some evidence on this is said to be forgeries.¹⁶ Also about the multitude of German peace proposals and efforts only in 2004/ 05 from

London files new information came to the public,¹⁷ which heavily incriminates Churchill as a warmonger and responsible for the millions of war victims from 1941 on. Thus, revisionism will certainly not run out of topics in the foreseeable future, and further surprises may be expected. In the long run, the historical truth will prevail. It is also important to ask about the circles and their motives that try to prevent this revision of contemporary history by all means, including those of state power. In this field, what the American historian Harry Elmer BARNES wrote in 1964 on the occasion of the campaign against the revisionist David L. Hoggan still applies: "The situation of 1964, together with the German consciousness of war guilt, represents a case of almost incomprehensible self-incrimination without parallel in the history of mankind. In any case, I know of no other example in history of a people showing this almost insane addiction to take upon itself the dark shadows of guilt for a political crime it did not commit, except for the crime of blaming itself for the Second World War. In 1926/27, the German government and public actively and enthusiastically supported research into the truth about 1914; in 1964, by contrast, those who researched the truth about 1939 were vilified and even subjected to persecution as political criminals. This fundamental fact was, of course, not mentioned in any way by the German press."¹⁸ The present work represents only an excerpt of the possible correctness of contemporary history. It may serve the spreading of the historical truth over some for the evaluation important processes from a century devastating for Germany and Europe. "Only the truth makes free"¹⁹ and creates the possibility for a peaceful coexistence of the peoples.